| 1 | wo | |
|----|---|----|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 5 | FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | Salt River Project Agricultural) No. CV 08-8028-PCT-JAT | |
| 8 | Improvement and Power District, et al., ORDER Plaintiffs, | |
| 9 |) | |
| 10 | VS.) | |
| 11 | Reynold R. Lee; et al., | |
| 12 | Defendants. | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | Pending before the Court is Plaintiff SRP's Rule 59(e) Motion to Alter or Amer | nd |
| 15 | Judgment (Doc. #91). The Court will grant Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration to the | |
| 16 | limited extent to make clear that the Court did not order the Secretary of the Interior to decide | |
| 17 | the dispute between SRP and the Defendants. Rather, the Court ordered that if the Plainti | |
| 18 | chooses to pursue its action, it must do so before the Secretary of the Interior, as set out | |
| 19 | the 1969 Lease. The Court denies the Rule 59(e) Motion (Doc. #91) in all other respects | |
| 20 | DATED this 11th day of March, 2009. | ٠. |
| 21 | DATED this 11th day of Warch, 2009. | |
| 22 | () () ((:More | |
| 23 | James A. Teilborg / United States District Judge | |
| 24 | United States District Judge | |

¹Though oral argument was requested on the Motion, because the parties submitted memoranda discussing the law and evidence in support of their positions and oral argument would not have aided the Court's decisional process, the Court will not set oral argument. *See e.g., Partridge v. Reich*, 141 F.3d 920, 926 (9th Cir. 1998).